

## Lab 4

1.

### EVIDENCE

Submitting Agency \_\_\_\_\_

Data Collected \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_

Item# \_\_\_\_\_ Case# \_\_\_\_\_

Collected By \_\_\_\_\_

Description of Evidence \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Location Where Collected \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Offense \_\_\_\_\_

### CHAIN OF CUSTODY

Rec. Form \_\_\_\_\_ By \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_

Rec. Form \_\_\_\_\_ By \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_

Rec. Form \_\_\_\_\_ By \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Time \_\_\_\_\_

Reference: [http://www.tigerofficer.com/Products/3%C2%BD-X-5-EvidenceChain-of-Custody-Labels---Pack-of-100\\_\\_EVE-8122.aspx](http://www.tigerofficer.com/Products/3%C2%BD-X-5-EvidenceChain-of-Custody-Labels---Pack-of-100__EVE-8122.aspx)

2. A case where Live memory image of a computer played a significant role in the outcome of a case is the United States vs Eric Thomas. Eric Thomas wife told the officer that her husband has been viewing child pornography on their home computer. The following morning, she turned on her desktop to find pictures of girls eight to ten years old full exposed. The officer obtained a verbal and written consent to search from Mrs Thomas. The officer did not speak to the defendant as he was asleep. The officers account he saw only two websites visible on the HP desktop computer and both contained images of child erotic. Nathan Dix, a detective, was off duty on this date but was summoned to the scene because of his experience in cybercrimes and child pornography cases. He again got verbal consent to search the computer.

Dix who was not trained to search live memory was HP computer to be examined by the Florida department of law enforcement. He removed the hard drive from the dell computer and done a began a forensic scan of video and images. Thomas woke up and tried to revoke the consent to search but Dix believed he had probably cause to seize the computers. There was a risk evidence might be destroyed. The defendant argues all the evidence obtained at the scene should be suppressed as there was no warrant or no consent. Thus, this violates his Fourth amendment. The court found no Fourth Amendment violation with the warrantless entry and initial searches of the. Such was justified based on the voluntary verbal and written consent given by Ms. Thomas his wife to both search and seize items from the home.